

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6 October 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR:

[redacted]

Historical Officer,
Office of Security

25X1

FROM

: Support Services Historical Officer (SSHO)

SUBJECT

: Review of Personnel Security (Rev. Sept 71)

REFERENCE

: Memo for [redacted] from SSHO, 12 Feb 71,
Personnel Security

25X1

1. At your request, I have reviewed the most recent (Sept 71) edition of the history of Personnel Security. Unfortunately, it appears that the second version of the paper is only longer, not better, than the first draft. As with the first version of the paper, the author has tried to cram every minute activity, change, instruction, or whatever, that was remotely related to personnel security into the paper. It didn't work. The paper is extremely difficult to follow, it is repetitious, the focus is constantly shifting, and at numerous points even the author lost himself. There has been an obvious effort to focus on personnel security rather than on the broad security picture -- unfortunately, however, there are still too many instances where the author has moved away from the principal story.

2. I have spent more time than I planned to on this report; and even though it has been heavily edited, it needs more thorough paring down than what I have recommended. As noted in Par. 1, there still are numerous questions which need to be answered.

3. The format of the paper presents a monstrous problem in itself, and I do have some positive suggestions:

a. The paper should be limited to the text, and as a part of the text there should be various Figures to which the text makes specific reference. The figures can be organization charts, statistical tables, or whatever;

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

and they should be numbered consecutively and follow immediately after the page of text which makes reference to them.

b. The paper should have a series of Appendixes. One such Appendix will be the list of sources (about which more will be said subsequently). Other Appendixes could be copies (or pertinent portions of) regulations, instructions, memorandums, charts, statistical tables, or other types of material to which specific reference is made in the text.

c. The paper might have an Attachment, but I would recommend against it except for the possible use of one complete issue of the OS newsletter type publication which appears in the present draft of the paper as "Appendix A, Exhibit H-4."

d. The items in the present version of the paper labeled as Appendix A (not the source list which is also labeled as Appendix A), Attachment A, and Attachment B are unusable in the present format. I have noted on Attachment A and Appendix A the need to select specific items for use in the text (per Par. 3 b, above). Attachment B, the history of the polygraph, should be pulled out and edited for publication as a separate monograph in the OS historical series. There is enough substance in this story for it to stand alone, but this segment, too, needs even more thorough editing than I have given it.

e. The list of sources for the report is incomplete and confusing and should be reexamined. Where sources have been cited as footnotes, these should be deleted and put in the list of sources.

4. I would also direct your author's attention to the questions which I raised in Par. 3 of my memorandum of 12 February 1971 concerning the first version of the subject paper. Little or no attempt appears to have been made to provide the kinds of information requested. Once again, therefore, I would suggest that some attention be paid to these rather pragmatic aspects of personnel security.

5. You have a major task before you in trying to reduce this work to manageable proportions, to make it

CONFIDENTIAL


CONFIDENTIAL

progress in orderly fashion, and to bring developments into sharper focus. Please call me if you have questions about my review or if you would like to discuss the paper further.

25X1

Distribution:

Orig. and 1-Addressee

- 1-
- 1-Ch/HS
- 1-DCh/HS
- ✓1-JBP
- 1-Chrono

25X1

CONFIDENTIAL